

R E M A R K S

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

THE CLAIMS

Claims 5, 7, and 10-13 have been canceled, without prejudice, and claim 6 has been amended to clarify that the set of products are arbitrarily determined. No new matter has been added, and it is respectfully requested that the amendment to claim 6 be approved and entered.

Re: THE DRAWINGS

Claims 5, 10 and 13 have been canceled, without prejudice, thereby obviating the objections to the drawings.

Re: THE REJECTION UNDER 35 USC 101

Claim 13 has been canceled, without prejudice, thereby obviating the rejection under 35 USC 101.

Re: THE REJECTION UNDER 35 USC 112, second paragraph

As pointed out hereinabove, claim 6 has been amended to clarify that the set of products are arbitrarily determined. And it is respectfully submitted that as a result of this amendment, the rejection of claim 6 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, has been overcome.

In addition, claims 6, 10 and 13 have been canceled, without prejudice, thereby obviating the rejections of these claims under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Re: THE REJECTION UNDER 35 USC 112, first paragraph

Claim 13 has been canceled, without prejudice, thereby obviating the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

Re: THE REJECTION UNDER 35 USC 102

Claims 2-4, 6, 9 and 10-13 (and claim 8?) were again rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by previously cited USP 6,189,980 ("Costanza").

This rejection, however, is again respectfully traversed with respect to independent claim 6 and claims 2-4, 8(?) and 9 which remain depending from claim 6 (and it is noted that the rejection of claims 10-13 has been obviated by the cancellation of these claims).

In item 10 on page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Costanza discloses at column 6, lines 56-64 and in Table VIII defining a series product by attribute and defining a product by values of the attribute. It is respectfully pointed out, however, that Costanza actually merely discloses defining products as groups of products that share at least one process. *only 1 possible example* In this connection, it is noted that although it is stated at

column 6, lines 57-58 state "A family of products is a grouping of products based on a common feature", Costanza further explains at column 6, lines 58-61 further that "Two primary examples of families of products include all of the products that are manufactured by the manufacturing line and all of the products defined in terms of a particular process." (emphasis added) In addition, it is respectfully pointed out that Table VIII merely shows the definition of products 1-9 in terms of processes 1-8. Still further, see also the disclosure at column 30, lines 35-53 where it is clearly stated that "Families of products are defined as groups of products that share at least one process."

By contrast, according to the method of the present invention as recited in independent claim 6, a set of products which have a collection of attributes of use and which are arbitrarily predetermined is defined as a series product, and each product contained in said series product is defined by a collection of values of said attributes of use. Then, the manufacturing series activities for achieving particular values of the individual attributes of use are set, and a manufacturing process for a particular product of the series product is derived by arranging said manufacturing series activities in a prescribed sequence. The particular product is then produced in accordance with the derived manufacturing process.

Thus, according to the present invention as recited in independent claim 6, first the series product having the collection of attributes of use is defined, then each product in

the series is defined (i.e., represented) by a collection of values of the attributes of use, and then the manufacturing series activities for achieving particular values of the individual attributes of use are set. On the other hand, Costanza first defines each product model, then defines processes for each product model, and then defines product models having common processes as a family of products.

In other words, according to the present invention as recited in independent claim 6, the manufacturing process is derived by specifying attributes of use without predefining a manufacturing process for a particular product, whereas Costanza predefines the manufacturing processes for a product.

Accordingly, it is again respectfully submitted that Costanza does not at all disclose, teach or suggest defining a series product having a collection of attributes of use, as according to the method of the present invention as recited in claim 6. And it is again respectfully submitted that the method of the present invention as recited in claim 6 entirely differs from the teachings of Costanza.

Still further, it is noted that claim 3 of the present application defines "attributes of use" as specific data items, whereas Costanza does not contain any such definition of "attributes of use" as specific data items. And it is noted that claim 9 of the present application determines parts used in the manufacturing process such as raw materials which are not

produced in the process, whereas Costanza does not refer to the parts such as raw materials.

In view of the foregoing, it is again respectfully submitted that the method of the present invention as recited in claim 6 and each of claims 2, 3, 4, 8 and 9 depending therefrom patentably distinguishes over Costanza under 35 USC 102(e).

Re: THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 103

Claims 5 and 7 have been canceled, without prejudice, thereby obviating the rejections under 35 USC 103.

\* \* \* \* \*

In view of the foregoing, entry of this Amendment, allowance of the claims and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas Holtz  
Reg. No. 33,902

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.  
767 Third Avenue - 25th Floor  
New York, New York 10017-2023  
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900  
Fax No. (212) 319-5101  
DH:yu



VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

Claim 6 has been amended as follows:

6. (Third Amended) A method comprising:

defining a set of products [having] which have a collection of attributes of use and which are arbitrarily predetermined as a series product;

5 defining each product contained in said series product by a collection of values of said attributes of use;

setting manufacturing series activities for achieving particular values of the individual attributes of use; and

10 deriving a manufacturing process for a particular product of the series product by arranging said manufacturing series activities in a prescribed sequence; and

producing the particular product in accordance with the derived manufacturing process.

RECEIVED  
SEP 23 2002  
GROUP 3600